the 103d Congress, H.R. 5128, which received broad, bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation today seeks to answer some of these apprehensions. I would, however, point out how deeply concerned I am about the haste in which this legislation was brought to the House floor. While I recognize the importance of what we are to do today, I am very troubled that certain important issues were not fully considered in committee. In their rush to pass their so-called Contract With America, the Republican majority has run roughshod over the democratic, deliberative process which we have been sworn to uphold. My Democratic colleagues in the Government Operations Committee, which I proudly served on last Congress, can attest to the outlandish manner in which this bill was handled in markup. This calculated attempt by my friends on the other side of the aisle to stifle thoughtful debate cannot and will not be ignored.

It was my hope that we in the House would debate the unfunded mandates issue in the normal manner in which legislation of this importance is considered. This debate today, however, is a culmination of a Republican-dominated legislative process that makes a mockery of this noble institution. Despite the modified open rule under which this bill is being considered, it is my understanding that my good friend, Chairman CLINGER, is opposed to any amendments other than those that are clerical and technical in nature. This is in order to pass a bill quickly to the other body. This is most unfortunate; I was looking forward to supporting and passing amendments that would protect our health, labor, and safety laws; that would protect the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts; and that would ensure the protection and strength of our social contracts with the elderly and the needy in this country. This will not happen today if the Republican majority has their way.

These and other critical concerns will not be addressed in this legislation because the majority party wishes to ram this into law just to say to their supporters that they can get things done in Washington. Well, Mr. Speaker, while I advocate the general intent of this legislation, I cannot support the manner in which the Republican majority has brought this bill to the floor. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stop our Republican friends from handcuffing our democratic institution, and I urge all my fellow Democrats to stop this Contract With America from undermining the democratic and deliberative principles that this institution has functioned under for the past 200 years.

BRINGING BACK THE DEDUCTION FOR LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSES

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to restore the business meal tax deduction to 100 percent. In 1993, as part of the President's economic plan, Congress passed legislation reducing the tax deduction for business meals and entertainment from 80 percent to 50 percent. I didn't see the wisdom of that $16.3 billion tax increase then, and I don't see it now.

Anyone who has owned a business or been involved in management can testify to the legitimacy of using meals and entertainment as a marketing tool. Yet we single out this particular business expense, penalizing the restaurant industry, the tourism and entertainment trades and the foodservice industry, to name only a few. When this deduction was reduced from 100 to 80 percent in the Tax Reform Act of 1986, it greatly impacted these industries—industries which are crucial to Nevada. Now, because of the reduction from 80 to 50 percent, it is estimated that almost three-quarters of mid-sized companies in America have made policy changes resulting in reductions in meal and entertainment expenses.

I can tell you from conversations I've had back home that many of Nevada's businesses rely heavily on the business meal and entertainment deduction as a marketing tool to solicit clients. Moreover, restoring the deduction is essential to the tourism trade—which employs almost a third of the State's labor force—in my home State of Nevada. Restoring the business meal deduction will increase restaurant patronage and convention business and help fill hotels and motels not only in Nevada, but across the country. I'm sure it would have a similar effect across the Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support my efforts to restore the 100 percent deductibility of business meal and entertainment expenses.

A TRIBUTE TO HIS MAJESTY KING BHUMIBOL ADULYADEJ (KING RAMA IX) OF THAILAND

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge King Rama IX of Thailand on the occasion of the Royal Golden Jubilee celebration which commences this month and continues through 1997. His Majesty will enter his 50th year of reign on June 9th.

His Majesty has been an extremely positive influence on his people and continues to be a constructive force in Southeast Asia and the world. His Majesty's influence can be discerned in his numerous projects, his lifelong interest in public health, his efforts to bring peaceful solutions in times of conflict, and his generosity in helping refugees in neighboring countries, especially the Karenni of Burma. His contributions have made King Bhumibol the prime source of inspiration, pride and joy among the Thai people.

TERRORIST EXCLUSION ACT, H.R. 650

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to reintroduce a bill I originally cosponsored and helped author in the 103d Congress under the leadership and efforts of our former colleague now in the other body, Ms. SNOWE. That bill, H.R. 2730, excluded from the United States any individual on the basis of mere membership in a terrorist organization, as such a group is defined by the Attorney General in consultation with the Secretary of State.

The bill I am reintroducing today, H.R. 650, is identical to H.R. 2730 from the last session of Congress. It will end the ridiculous situation we now have where we often have our State Department officials wringing their hands and spending countless hours trying to determine the nature of the visa applicant's membership and level of activity within a terrorist organization or group.

Similar provisions as were in H.R. 2730 passed the other body under the leadership of Senator HANK BROWN during the 103d Congress. However, unfortunately, they did not become law; nor did the House get an opportunity to act to close this glaring loophole in the immigration laws and the State Department's interpretation of those laws today.

Today we often see time-consuming State Department analysis made to determine whether to deny a visa to an individual who is a mere member of a terrorist group, but hasn't yet been convicted of an act of terrorism in an appropriate court of law and with some consular officer's view of appropriate due process.

Under our State Department's view of current law, mere membership alone doesn't automatically create a presumptive basis for denial of a visa, therefor the protracted analysis and soul searching I mentioned, often follows.

The bill I introduce today shifts the burden of proof and makes the denial of the visa presumptive based upon mere membership by the visa applicant in a terrorist organization alone, as defined by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State based upon available. data.

The visa applicant, not the State Department consular officer, must make the case for his or her right to travel to the United States.

The Secretary of State in a recent JFK School of Government speech said that the State Department was going to get tough on international terrorism and international criminals. In fact, as part of the administration's plan of action, the Secretary said ''* * * we will toughen standards for obtaining visas for international criminals to gain entry to this country.''

Surely, to the average American, those who are members of overseas terrorist groups, as such groups are determined by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State under by bill, would clearly fit the category of international criminals.

International criminals, whether yet formally convicted or not of terrorism, or who we may or may not know want to travel to the United States to engage in possible terrorist acts ought not get U.S. entry visas. It is as simple as that, and my bill will bring that about.

The public would demand our State Department exercise the visa issuance discretionary function and authority in the best interests of the United States, and denial should be in order in such membership cases, one would hope. The benefit of the doubt should go to the U.S. interests. However, let us not rely on hope or ambiguity; my bill gives the State Department clear authority, the ability, and the direction to deny visas in the case of mere

membership in these overseas terrorist organizations, as determined by the Attorney General along with the Secretary of State.

The administration, which has wisely stepped up the activity and rhetoric against terrorism, should also ensure that the rhetoric it uses on international crime, terrorism, and efforts to protect U.S. interests, fully matches their actions. My bill, which I introduce today, gives them a chance to support additional and needed real reform to thwart a growing and dangerous new terrorist threat aimed at America's interests and security, here at home.

I ask that the full text of the bill be printed here at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. 650

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MEMBERSHIP IN A TERRORIST ORGANIZATION AS A BASIS FOR EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.

Section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(II) by inserting ''or'' at the end;

(2) by adding after clause (i)(II) the following:

''(III) is a member of an organization that engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity or who actively supports or advocates terrorist activity,''; and

(3) by adding after clause (iii) the following:

''(iv) TERRORIST ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—As used in this Act, the term 'terrorist organization' means an organization which commits terrorist activity as determined by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State.''.

ANDREÁ MARION: A LIFETIME OF INNOVATION AND INTEGRITY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring recognition to an extraordinary man on the occasion of his retirement as the president of Applied Biosystems, Inc., in Foster City, CA. Mr. André F. Marion has been a pioneer in the emerging and important field of biotechnology and a pioneer in employee and customer relations. As Mr. Marion moves on to the next stage in his life, his intelligence and creativity will be sorely missed.

Mr. Marion, with a handful of associates, essentially began the biotechnology industry. In 1991 he left the research and development staff of the Hewlett Packard Co. to build the first DNA sequencer that began the biotechnology revolution. But even the tremendous financial and business success of his company is not Mr. Marion's true legacy.

During his 12 years as president, chief executive officer, and chairman of the board of Applied Biosystems, Inc., Mr. Marion ran his company with what he himself called ''Values for Success,'' which included absolute attachment to integrity, consideration of the customer, and the highest achievable level of quality. He shared with his employees equally in the profits, stock options, and even the physical setting of the company's campus.

André Marion is a model for all entrepreneurs, executives, and those involved in business and government to follow. I commend him in the strongest possible terms and wish him a long and happy retirement.

COMPEER, INC. COMPEER FRIENDSHIP WEEK

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mrs. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this year 117 Compeer programs across the Nation will celebrate Compeer Friendship Week from April 23 to April 29, 1995. The goal of Compeer Friendship Week is to provide an opportunity for each Compeer program to increase its name recognition, gain community support and recruit volunteers. Compeer programs will be hosting many special events during this week.

The Compeer Program, which originated in my home district of Rochester, NY, is now in its 22nd year of existence in Rochester, and its 12th year nationwide. Begun as an adopt-a-patient program at the Rochester Psychiatric Center in 1973, Compeer matches caring, sensitive and trained volunteers to those who are isolated, lonely or persons who, because of a mental illness, experience difficulty in coping. Compeer is based on the concept that, through the sharing of friendship, volunteers can offset the sometimes systematized isolation and loneliness of those diagnosed with mental illnesses, and relieve families of their continuous focus on care.

In the past, persons with a mental illness have been discharged into communities where, in theory, they would lead richer, more productive lives than they would in institutions. The reality proves otherwise. People who suffer from illness, who are living both in and out of hospitals, suffer from isolation and loneliness. The majority lack a support system of either friends or family.

Compeer has helped to change this. A unique partnership between volunteer, client, therapist and Compeer staff has enabled hundreds to become fully integrated into society as mentally and emotionally healthy individuals. In an era of health care cost containment, decreased funding for mental illness, skyrocketing costs of psychiatric hospitalizations, and deteriorating traditional support systems, Compeer addressed a national problem by providing cost-effective utilization of volunteers as an adjunct to therapy. Compeer has made a tremendous difference in our country—fostering and nurturing new friendships, filling the gaps of loneliness, and building bridges of understanding and hope.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Compeer Friendship Week from April 23 to April 29, 1995, and in congratulating the volunteers, clients, therapists, and staff of Compeer for their selfless and tireless efforts.

SSI REFORM

HON. BLANCHE L. LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1995

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to begin a series of discussions over the direction of a program that began with the noblest of intentions, but is rapidly turning into a mockery of the Government's ability to help its citizens. I am speaking of the Supplemental Security Income program for children.

The SSI program was created as a part of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 in order to assist aged, blind, and disabled individuals with supplemental cash assistance. At the time that the law was being written, there was debate over whether or not to include children. The House believed that children should qualify and wrote that, ''. . . disabled children . . . are deserving of special assistance in order to help them become self-supporting members of our society.'' The other body disagreed, arguing that the needs of disabled children were no greater than the needs of non-disabled childern—with the exception of health care costs, which were covered under the Medicaid program. Ultimately the House prevailed and disabled children were included.

Mr. Speaker, that was over 23 years ago. After the program was established, 71,000 blind and disabled children received SSI. Today over 700,000 children receive SSI and the question over whether or not they should be eligible is still unresolved.

When the program was implemented both adults and children were eligible after the Social Security Administration compared their disability against a ''Medical Listing of Impairments.'' Adults who did not qualify under the medical listings were entitled to another test called the residual functional capacity test which measured their ability to engage in ''substantial gainful activity''—or work. Because most children did not work, they were not given the option of a second test and were simply denied benefits if they did not meet the medical listings.

For 16 years the process worked in this manner until February of 1990 when the Supreme Court ruled in favor of a plaintiff, a child who had been denied benefits because he did not meet the medical listings. That decision in Sullivan versus Zebley proved to be a watershed moment in the history of SSI for children.

As a result of the Zebley decision, the Social Security Administration was ordered to develop a process that would allow a child to have a separate test administered in the case that they did not meet the medical listings. Experts were called in and meetings were held for months on end. And when the meetings were over, the SSA had created a process known as the Individualized Functional Assessment or IFA.

Because children could not be judged on an ability to work, the IFA was intended to cover specific age-appropriate activities and developmental milestones. Five different so-called developmental domains were established to determine disability which included motor functioning, communicative skills, cognition, socialization, and behavior.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at this point that I agree with the Zebley decision—because I believe that in the context of the original statute,